## **FX PARTE OR LATE FILED**

## COLE, RAYWID & BRAVERMAN, L.L.P.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

SECOND FLOOR

1919 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006-3458

(202) 659-9750

ALAN RAYWID (1930-1991)

OF COUNSEL FRANCES J. CHETWYND ELLEN S. DEUTSCH

> **FACSIMILE** (202) 452-0067

INTERNET

May 13, 1999

WWW.CRBLAW.COM

RECEIVED

MAY 131999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

\*ADMITTED IN OKLAHOMA ONLY \*ADMITTED IN CALIFORNIA ONLY

CHRISTIN S. MCMELEY

HEATHER M. WILSON DAVID N. TOBENKIN'

JOHN P. COLE, JR.

PAUL GLIST

ANN FLOWERS ROBERT G. SCOTT, JR.

BURT A. BRAVERMAN ROBERT L. JAMES JOHN D. SEIVER WESLEY R. HEPPLER

DAVID M. SILVERMAN JAMES F. IRELAND, III

STEVEN J. HORVITZ CHRISTOPHER W. SAVAGE

SUSAN WHELAN WESTFALL

THERESA A. ZETERBERG KARLYN D. STANLEY

JOHN DAVIDSON THOMAS JOHN C. DODGE FREDERICK W. GIROUX GEOFFREY C. COOK

MARIA T. BROWNE DONNA C. RATTLEY THOMAS SCOTT THOMPSON ADAM S. CALDWELL

SANDRA GREINER JAMES W. TOMLINSON MARK S. KRISTIANSEN

> Magalie Roman Salas Secretary Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

> > Notice of Permitted Ex Parte Contact, CC Docket No. 96-98 and CC Docket No. 99-68/(Intercarrier Compensation for ISP-Bound Calls).

Dear Ms. Salas:

The purpose of this letter is to advise the Commission of a permitted ex parte contact in the above-referenced proceeding. A meeting was held on May 5, 1999, attended by Tamra Preiss and Ed Krachmer of the Common Carrier Bureau, and Mr. Christopher W. Savage and Mr. William J. Rooney, Jr., on behalf of Global NAPS, Inc.

At the meeting, the attendees discussed issues raised in Global NAPs' Comments and Reply Comments in the above-referenced docket. These issues included the economic basis for inter-carrier compensation for ISP-bound calls and the relative merits of using a state-PSC-determined TELRIC call termination rate, as opposed to an FCC-determined interstate local switching rate, as a reasonable "proxy" for CLEC costs of delivering ISP-bound calls to ISPs served by the CLEC. The attendees also discussed the legal theories upon which the Commission might rely in setting rules governing such compensation. The theories discussed were direct Commission action under Section 201(a) (on the theory that ISP-bound traffic is subject to Commission jurisdiction), and/or the promulgation of rules binding on states in their implementation of Section Magalie Roman Salas May 13, 1999 Page -2-

251(b)(5), which would be promulgated in light of the Supreme Court's declaration of the scope of the Commission's rulemaking authority under Section 201(b). Finally, the attendees discussed the applicability of Section 252(i) to intercarrier compensation agreements for ISP-bound traffic.

Please contact the undersigned if you have any questions about this matter.

////

Christopher W. Savage

cc: Ms. Preiss

Mr. Krachmer